

REMARKS

Entry of this Amendment and reconsideration are respectfully requested in view of the amendments made to the claims and for the remarks made herein.

Claims 1 and 3-11 are pending in the application and stand rejected.

Claims 1, 4-6 and 11 are independent claims.

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended. Claim 3 has been cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Staron (USP no. 5, 805, 230) in view of Klarfeld (USPPA no. 2006/0206912). Claims 4-6 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Staron in view of Klarfeld and further in view of Lin (USP no. 6, 934, 917).

With regard to the rejection of claims 1-11 as being unpatentable under 35 USC 103 in view of Staron and Klarfeld, applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the rejection of the claims. However, independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended to further recite that profiles may also include information regarding individually selected channels, the names and properties of the individually selected channels are incorporated into the profile and that the channels are selected based on selected ones of the categories of the user profiles. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments to the claims may be found at least on page 3, lines 11-12 ("it is preferred to only retrieve information for the categories selected by the user as part of the profile"), page 8, lines 9-15, ("In addition to specifying categories, preferably the user can also select individual channels. In a digital system, like the DVB system, the transport stream includes the channel name of all channels in the stream. This information (or a subset thereof) can be presented to the user, to enable the user to select a specific channel. As an example, the user can specify 'CNN' as a desired station. The user can also ensure that CNN will be installed by specifying country/area = US, language = English, and channel type = news, but this can easily result in the installation of many unwanted stations (e.g. NBC news")), on page 8, lines 21-25 ("For each channel,

the stored profile is compared against channel-specific information for each preference category defined in the profile. As an example, assuming that a user would like CNN to be installed as channel 20, the property values of the three exemplary preference categories for channel 20 are: US, English and News.") and in cancelled claim 3.

Staron discloses a system for automatic programming of a television tuner and video recorder that makes use of data received by a transmission device (cable, terrestrial and/or satellite radio) wherein a set of channel tables corresponding to a broadcasting station are transmitted. The television memorizes the table corresponding to the postal ZIP codes and sorts the available channels based on a range of ZIP codes which the television may be located within.

Staron fails to disclose selection of channels based on preference profile to determine additional extraction of programs. This deficiency in the teaching of Staron is acknowledged in the Office Action. (see page 3, line 16-17).

Klarfeld discloses a personal TV system that receives a plurality of video segments constituting a TV program and information describing each segment and controls the display of the segments to a viewer in accordance with preferences of the viewer and with the description of each segment. Klarfeld discloses a preference database, item 106, Figure 1, which includes information associated with categories, and traits of a user. Klarfeld further discloses that the preference profiles are associated with determining recording information associated with received programs (see for example, para. 0156). For example, Klarfeld discloses that preference profiles are created based on user viewing habits and that priorities are determined based the viewing habits. The priorities are used to determine which channel is to be recorded.

However, Klarfeld fails to provide any teaching regarding using the preference profiles to install a subset of available channels based on the user profiles, as is recited in the claims. Rather, Klarfeld uses the profile to record a selected channel from among all the available channels.

Accordingly, the combination of Staron and Klarfeld fails to disclose the selection of individual channels and incorporating the properties of the individual channels into

categories or retrieving information from the channels based on selected categories, as is recited in the claims.

A claimed invention is *prima facie* obvious when three basic criteria are met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the reference themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the teachings therein. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. And, third, the prior art reference or combined references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

In this case, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made with regard to independent claims 1 and 11 as each of the elements recited in these independent claims is not disclosed by the combination of the cited references.

With regard to the remaining claims, these claims depend from the independent claims and, hence, are also not obvious by virtue of their dependency upon an allowable base claim.

With regard to the rejection of claims 4-6 as being unpatentable over Staron, Klarfeld and further in view of Lin, applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the rejection of the claims.

Claims 4-6 depend from claim 1, which has been shown to include subject matter not disclosed by Staron and Klarfeld. Lin fails to provide any teaching regarding the deficiency in subject matter found to exist in the combination of Staron and Klarfeld. Hence, the combination of Staron, Klarfeld and Lin fails to include all the elements recited in independent claim 1 and, consequently, dependent claims 4-6.

For the amendments made to the claims and for the remarks made herein, applicant submits that all the objections and rejections have been overcome and that the claims are in a condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that all the rejections of the claims be withdrawn and that a Notice of Allowance be issued.

Should the Examiner believe that the disposition of any issues arising from this response may be best resolved by a telephone call, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
Daniel Piotrowski

Date: November 4, 2008

/Carl A. Giordano/
By: Carl A. Giordano
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 41,780

Mail all correspondence to:
Daniel Piotrowski, Registration No. 42,079
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9608
Fax: (914) 332-0615

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.8(a)

The undersigned hereby certifies that this document is being
[] Transmitted by facsimile to 571 273 8300;
[] Placed with the US Postal Service with First Class postage attached to the address indicated above;
on November _____, 2008.

Print Name

Signature